

On Landsberg's criterion for complete intersections

S. L'vovsky*

August 24, 1994

Introduction

In his preprint [1], J.M. Landsberg introduces an elementary characterization of complete intersections (Proposition 1.2 in [1]). The proof of this proposition uses the method of moving frames. The aim of this note is to present an elementary proof of Landsberg's criterion that is valid over any ground field.

1 Notation and statement of results

Let k be an algebraically closed field and $\mathbf{P}^N = \text{Proj } k[T_0, \dots, T_N]$ the N -dimensional projective space over k . If F is a homogeneous polynomial in $T_0, \dots, T_N$, we will denote by $Z(F) \subset \mathbf{P}^N$ the hypersurface defined by F . If F is a homogeneous polynomial and $x = (x_0 : \dots : x_N) \in \mathbf{P}^N$, put $d_x F = (\partial F / \partial T_0(z), \dots, \partial F / \partial T_N(z)) \in k^{N+1}$ (actually $d_x F$ depends on the choice of homogeneous coordinates for x ; this abuse of notation should not lead to confusion). If $x \in X$, where $X \subset \mathbf{P}^N$ is a projective variety, then $T_x X \subset \mathbf{P}^N$ denotes the embedded Zariski tangent space to X at x .

If $X \subset \mathbf{P}^N$ is a projective variety, then its ideal sheaf will be denoted by $\mathcal{I}_X \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^N}$ and its homogeneous ideal by $I_X \subset k[T_0, \dots, T_N]$. We will say that a hypersurface $Y = Z(F)$ *trivially contains* X iff $F = \sum G_i F_i$, where G_i 's and F_i 's are homogeneous polynomials, F_i vanish on X for all i , and $\deg F_i < \deg F$ for all i . If Y trivially contains X , then $Y \supset X$. We will say that a hypersurface W *non-trivially contains* X iff W contains X , but not trivially.

The following proposition is a slight reformulation of Landsberg's criterion (cf. [1, Proposition 1.2]):

Proposition 1.1 *For a projective variety $X \subset \mathbf{P}^N$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

*Partially supported by an ISF grant

- (i) X is a complete intersection.
- (ii) There exists a smooth point $x \in X$ having the following property: any hypersurface $W \subset \mathbf{P}^N$ that non-trivially contains X must be smooth at x .
- (iii) For any smooth point $x \in X$ and any hypersurface W that non-trivially contains X , W is smooth at x .
- (iv) For any smooth point $x \in X$ and any hypersurface W that non-trivially contains X , $T_x W$ cannot contain an intersection $\bigcap_i T_x W_i$, where each W_i is a hypersurface s.t. $W_i \supset X$ and $\deg W_i < \deg W$ (it is understood that the intersection of an empty family of tangent spaces is the entire $\mathbf{P}^N$).

2 Proofs

For the sequel we need two lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $F_1, \dots, F_r$ be homogeneous polynomials over k in $T_0, \dots, T_N$. Assume that $x = (x_0 : \dots : x_N) \in \mathbf{P}^N$ is their common zero and that the vectors $d_x F_1, \dots, d_x F_r$ are linearly dependent. Then one of the following alternatives holds:*

- 1. *There is $j \in [1; r]$ s.t. F_j belongs to the ideal in $k[T_0, \dots, T_N]$ generated by F_i 's with $i \neq j$.*
- 2. *There are homogeneous polynomials $\tilde{F}_0, \dots, \tilde{F}_N$ s.t. the ideals $(F_0, \dots, F_N)$ and $(\tilde{F}_0, \dots, \tilde{F}_N)$ coincide, $\deg \tilde{F}_i = \deg F_i$ for all i , and $d_x \tilde{F}_j = 0$ for some j .*

Proof. Let the shortest linear relation among $d_x F_j$'s have the form

$$\lambda_1 d_x F_1 + \dots + \lambda_s d_x F_s = 0,$$

where $\lambda_j \neq 0$ for all j . Reordering F_j 's if necessary, we may assume that $\deg F_1 \leq \deg F_2 \leq \dots \leq \deg F_s$. Let t be such a number that $\deg F_t = \deg F_s$ and $\deg F_{t-1} < \deg F_s$ (if $\deg F_1 = \deg F_s$, set $t = 1$).

If the polynomials $F_t, \dots, F_s$ are linearly dependent, then it is clear that one of them lies in the ideal generated by the others and there is nothing more to prove. Assume from now on that $F_t, F_{t+1}, \dots, F_s$ are linearly independent. Then there exists an index $j \in [t; s]$ and numbers μ_i , where $i \in [t; s]$ s.t.

$$F_j = \sum_{i \in [t; s] \setminus \{j\}} \mu_i F_i + \mu_j (\lambda_t F_t + \dots + \lambda_s F_s). \quad (1)$$

For each $i \in [1; t-1]$, choose a homogeneous polynomial G_i s.t. $\deg G_i = \deg F_s - \deg F_i$ and $G_i(x_0, \dots, x_N) = \lambda_i$, and set

$$\tilde{F}_j = \sum_{i < t} G_i F_i + \sum_{i \geq t} \lambda_i F_i. \quad (2)$$

If $\tilde{F}_j = 0$, then $F_s \in (F_1, \dots, F_{s-1})$ and the first alternative holds. Otherwise, $\deg \tilde{F}_j = \deg F_j$, $d_x \tilde{F}_j = 0$ by virtue of (2), and it follows from (1) and (2) that

$$F_j = \sum_{i \in [t; s] \setminus \{j\}} \mu_i F_i + \mu_j \tilde{F}_j - \mu_j \sum_{i < t} G_i F_i,$$

whence $(F_1, \dots, F_{j-1}, \tilde{F}_j, F_{j+1}, \dots, F_s) = (F_1, \dots, F_s)$. Hence in this case the second alternative holds, and we are done.

The second lemma belongs to folklore. To state this lemma, let us introduce some notation. Denote by $\mathbf{S}$ the set of sequences of non-negative integers $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots)$ s.t. $\delta_M = 0$ for all $M \gg 0$. If $\delta, \eta \in \mathbf{S}$, we will write $\delta \succ \eta$ iff there is an integer i s.t. $\delta_i > \eta_i$ and $\delta_j = \eta_j$ for all $j > i$.

Lemma 2.2 *Any sequence $\delta_1 \succ \delta_2 \succ \dots$ must terminate.*

Proof. For any $\delta \in \mathbf{S}$, set $n(\delta) = \max\{j : \delta_j \neq 0\}$, $\ell(\delta) = \delta_{n(\delta)} > 0$. If $\delta \succ \eta$ and $n(\delta) = n(\eta)$, then $\ell(\delta) \geq \ell(\eta)$. Let us prove the lemma by induction on $n(\delta_1)$.

If $n(\delta_1) \leq 1$, the result is evident. Assuming that the lemma is true whenever $n(\delta_1) < m$, suppose that there is an infinite sequence $\delta_1 \succ \delta_2 \succ \dots$ with $n(\delta_1) = m$. If $n(\delta_j) < n(\delta_1)$ for some j , we arrive at a contradiction by the induction hypothesis. Hence, $n(\delta_j) = n(\delta_1) = m$ for all j and $\ell(\delta_1) \geq \ell(\delta_2) \geq \dots > 0$. Thus there exists an integer N s.t. $\ell(\delta_j)$ is constant for $j \geq N$. For any $j \geq N$, denote by $\delta'_j \in \mathbf{S}$ a sequence that is obtained from δ_j by replacing its last positive term by zero. It is clear that $\delta'_N \succ \delta'_{N+1} \succ \dots$, and this sequence is infinite by our assumption. This is again impossible by the induction hypothesis since $n(\delta'_j) < n(\delta_j) = m$, whence the lemma.

Proof of (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Put $a = N - \dim X$. Let $(F_1, \dots, F_r)$ be a system of (homogeneous) generators of I_X . To any such system assign a sequence $\delta(F_1, \dots, F_r) \in \mathbf{S}$, where $\delta(F_1, \dots, F_r)_i = \#\{j \in [1; r] : \deg F_j = i\}$. I claim that

if $r > a$, then $I_X = (\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s)$, where Φ_i 's are homogeneous polynomials s.t. $\delta(F_1, \dots, F_r) \succ \delta(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s)$.

To prove this claim, observe that $d_x F_1, \dots, d_x F_r$ are linearly dependent since X is smooth at x and $r > \text{codim } X$. Now Lemma 2.1 implies that either one of the F_j 's (say, F_1) can be removed without affecting I_X , or $I_X = (\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_r)$, where $\deg \tilde{F}_j = \deg F_j$ for all j and $d_x \tilde{F}_j = 0$ for some j . In the first case, the required $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s$ can be obtained by merely removing F_1 ; in the second case, hypothesis (ii) shows that $\tilde{F}_j = \sum_{i=1}^t G_i \Psi_i$, where $\Psi_i \in I_X$ and $\deg \Psi_i < \deg \tilde{F}_j$ for all j . Replacing $\tilde{F}_j$ by $\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_t$ in the sequence $\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_r$ and putting $s = r + t - 1$, we obtain a sequence $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s$ s.t. $I_X = (\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s)$ and $\delta(\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_r) \succ \delta(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s)$. Since the degrees of $\tilde{F}_j$'s and F_j 's are the same, this means that $\delta(F_1, \dots, F_r) \succ \delta(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s)$ as well, and the claim is proved.

Now we can finish the proof as follows. If $r = a$, then X is the complete intersection of $Z(F_1), \dots, Z(F_r)$ and there is nothing to prove. If $r > a$, then by virtue of our claim we can replace the system of generators $F_1, \dots, F_r$ by $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_s$. Let us iterate this process. By virtue of Lemma 2.2 this process must terminate and by virtue of our claim this is possible only when we have found a system of exactly a generators of the ideal I_X . This means that X is a complete intersection, thus completing our proof.

Proof of $(iv) \Rightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (ii)$. Trivial.

Proof of $(i) \Rightarrow (iv)$. Let X be a complete intersection of the hypersurfaces $Z(F_1), \dots, Z(F_a)$. Assume that a hypersurface $W = Z(F)$, with F irreducible, non-trivially contains X and that $x = (x_0 : \dots : x_N) \in \mathbf{P}^N$ is a smooth point of X ; set $m = \deg F$. Since $Z(F) \supset X$ and X is a complete intersection of the $Z(F_i)$'s, we see that

$$F = \sum G_i F_i; \quad (3)$$

since W contains X non-trivially, at least some of the G_j 's must be non-zero constants. Reordering F_j 's if necessary, we may assume that G_j is a constant (hence, $\deg F_j = m$) iff $1 \leq j \leq s$. Taking d_x of the both parts of (3), we see that

$$d_x F = \sum_{i=1}^a c_i d_x F_i, \quad \text{where } c_i \neq 0 \text{ for some } i \in [1; s]. \quad (4)$$

On the other hand, assume that $W_i = Z(B_i)$ with irreducible B_i 's. Then the hypothesis implies that $d_x F$ is a linear combination of $d_x B_j$'s, and the fact that X is a complete intersection of $Z(F_t)$'s and $Z(B_j) \supset X$ implies that, for each j , there is a relation

$$B_j = \sum_{t>s} G_{jt} F_t \quad (5)$$

(it suffices to sum only over $t > s$ since for $t \leq s$ we have $\deg F_t = \deg W > \deg B_j$). If we take d_x of both parts of (5), we see that, for each j , $d_x B_j$ is a linear combination of $d_x F_t$'s with $t > s$. Hence $d_x F$ is also a linear combination of $d_x F_t$'s with $t > s$. Taking into account (4) we see that $d_x F_i$'s are linearly dependent. This is, however, impossible since x is a smooth point of the complete intersection of $Z(F_j)$'s. This contradiction completes the proof.

References

- [1] Landsberg, J. M. Differential-Geometric Characterizations of Complete Intersections. Preprint, alg-geom/9407002

Email address: serge@schcorr.msk.su
nskcsmoscow@glas.apc.org